

## REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are now pending in the application. Of these pending claims, Claims 2, 3 and 8 have been allowed, Claims 1, 5, and 7 stand rejected, and Claims 4, 6 and 9 are objected to. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

## SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Supitilov (U.S. Pat. No. 3,772,538). In view of the amendments and arguments herein, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's attention is directed to amended Claim 1 which includes the limitation that the blind fastener setting tool has a pair of movable jaws configured to engage the fastener during a setting operation. To expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to further clarify that Claim 1 is directed to a blind fastener setting tool. Applicant notes that the cited reference, namely Supitilov, only discloses a center bolt-type acoustic transducer and does not disclose a fastener setting tool.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 5, Applicant notes that Claim 5 has been amended to depend on allowable Claim 2. As such, Applicant submits Claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to independent Claim 7 which includes the limitation that the fastener is plastically deformed during the setting operation. As specifically noted and described above, the Supitilov reference does not describe a setting tool or a method of measuring the load exerted by a fastener during a setting operation. While the Supitilov reference teaches placing a bolt through a piezo-electric transducer to hold a piezo-electric element in place, it does not teach measuring the load on a fastener during a setting process. Applicant further notes that Figure 1 of the cited reference shows a pair of deformable washers which would indicate that the system is not configured to measure the load on the threaded fastener.

#### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 2, 3, and 8 are allowed. The Examiner states that Claims 4, 6, and 9 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has amended Claim 6 to include the limitations of the intervening claims.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/2 - 2005

By:   
Christopher A. Eusebi  
Reg. No. 44,672

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

CAE/smb